

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

SEP 26 2006

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS:

Claims remain 18-26 remain in the application. Claims 27-35 have been added. Applicant believes the amendments don't add new matter. Applicant believes the claims are least supported with respect to paragraphs 51-59 of the application as filed.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103

The Examiner rejected claims 28-26 as being unpatentable over Rowe in view of Graunke.

The Examiner relies on Rowe to teach transmitting games over a communication link to a gaming terminal where the configuration of a transmitted game may be based on the jurisdiction in which the game is operated and Graunke to teach a method of encryption.

In the claims as amended, executable code for a plurality of games, including a first game and a second game, is stored on a gaming device where each of the plurality of games is stored in an encrypted format. Further, in the claims it is described, that a first set of operating data for a first game is encrypted with a first private key and a second set of operating data for a second game is encrypted with a second private key. In addition, in the claims, it is described that only one of the first private or the second private key is provided on the gaming device to prevent execution of the first game or the second game on the gaming device. Yet further, in the claims, it is described that the gaming device is operable to send information relating to decrypted one of the first set of operating data or the second set of operating data to a remote device to authenticate the decrypted one of the first set of operating data or the second set of operating data wherein the gaming device is operable to take remedial action when the decrypted one of first set of operating data or the second set of operating data is not authenticated by the remote device.

The combination of Rowe and Graunke doesn't teach the claim limitations as amended. For example, the combination of Rowe and Graunke, as recited in claim 22, doesn't teach or suggest a controller operable to a) send information relating to the decrypted one of the first set of operating data or the second set of operating data to a remote device to authenticate the decrypted one of the first set of operating data or the second set of operating data, b) to take remedial action when the decrypted one of first set of operating data or the second set of operating data is not authenticated by the remote device. As another example, the combination doesn't teach or suggest storing the first game and the second game on the gaming device but providing only one of the first private key or the second private key to prevent execution of the

first game or the second game on the gaming device. Therefore, for at least these reasons, the combination of Rowe and Graunke can't be said to render obvious the claims as amended and the rejection is believed overcome thereby.

Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



David P. Olynick
Reg. No.: 48,615

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(510) 663-1100